Z
695
M12

UC-NRLF

B 4 209 740

BERKELEY
LIBRARY

MEANS AND END IN MAKING A CONCORDANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DANTE AND PETRARCH

BY

KENNETH McKENZIE

YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

785

A28
M156

GINN & COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

MEANS AND END IN MAKING A CONCORDANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DANTE AND PETRARCH

BY

KENNETH McKENZIE

YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

GINN & COMPANY

BOSTON · NEW YORK · CHICAGO · LONDON

Z695
M12
LIBRARY
SCHOOL

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MEANS AND END IN MAKING A CONCORDANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DANTE AND PETRARCH

Among the many noteworthy achievements of the Dante Society, perhaps the most important has been the preparation and publication, through the scholarship, industry, and financial generosity of its members, of concordances to the works of Dante. The *Concordance of the Divina Commedia*, by Dr. Edward Allen Fay, was published in 1888, followed in 1905 by the *Concordanza delle Opere Italiane in Prosa e del Canzoniere di Dante Alighieri*, edited by Professor E. S. Sheldon, with the assistance of Mr. A. C. White. The concordance to the Latin works is being rapidly made ready for the printer by Professor E. K. Rand and Mr. E. H. Wilkins. Since the society has been so active along this line, it seems not inappropriate to present here, in somewhat enlarged form, a paper which was originally read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, at Yale University, in December, 1906, dealing with the history and exact meaning of the term *concordance;* the proper functions of a concordance as distinguished from other works of reference, such as an index or a dictionary; and the different methods of adapting means to end in such books. In the course of the discussion particular attention will be paid to the reference books which have been published for the study of Dante.

The English word *concordance* has been used from the fourteenth century onward to designate an index to the words of the Bible or of some other book. Thus in Trevisa's translation of Higden (1387)[1] we find the statement that "Frere Hewe . . . expownede al

[1] *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden; together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. R. Lumby (Rolls Series), London, 1882, vol. viii, p. 235. Higden's text has "magnas super bibliam concordancias compilavit"; the anonymous translator, "compilede grete concordances on the bible." See also *New English Dictionary*, s.v. Concordance.

160608

þe bible, and made a greet concordaunce uppon þe bible"; and in 1460 Capgrave[1] says that "Hewe . . . was eke the first begynner of the Concordauns, whech is a tabil onto the Bibil." This Frere Hewe, a French cardinal, usually called Hugo de S. Caro,[2] with the aid, it is said, of five hundred Dominican monks, compiled at Paris about 1244 a verbal index to the Vulgate, calling it *Concordantiæ*. This work was merely a list of the words in the Bible, with references to the chapters, and portions of chapters, where they occur.[3] Other churchmen, a few years later, improved Hugo's work by adding citations of the context, as in modern concordances; since they were Englishmen, their work was called the English Concordance.[4] The use of the Bible index evidently commended itself, and the work of Hugo's successors was condensed and frequently copied. In the fourteenth century we hear of Bibles with concordances being among the books chained for public use in the church of St. Nicholas, Newcastle, and in St. George's, Windsor.[5] Several concordances in Latin were printed in the fifteenth century, and in the sixteenth they appeared in Greek, English, German, and French. In the fifteenth century the Rabbi Isaac Nathan, finding that the

[1] John Capgrave, *The Chronicle of England*, ed. F. C. Hingeston (Rolls Series), London, 1858, p. 154. The editor (*ibid.*, footnote) erroneously identifies Hewe with Hugo de S. Victore.

[2] See Bindseil, *Ueber die Concordanzen*, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, vol. xliii, p. 676 (1870); *Sacrorum Bibliorum Concordantiæ Hugonis Cardinalis*, Venetiis, 1768 (preface by Hubertus Phalesius, § 4: De auctore Concordantiarum); quotation in Du Cange, *Glossarium*, s.v. Concordantia: "dominus Ugo cardinalis . . . Concordantiarum Bibliæ primus auctor fuit."

[3] The division of the Bible into chapters was made by Stephen Langton (d. 1228; see *Dictionary of National Biography*); as the division into verses had not yet been made, — it is due to R. Stephanus, 1545, — Hugo indicated the portions of each chapter by letters, which were used for several centuries, even after the division into verses had been introduced.

[4] Cf. Bindseil, *loc. cit.*; and also T. Walsingham, *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani*, ed. Riley (Rolls Series), London, 1863, vol. i, p. 16: "Frater Johannes de Derlyngton . . . hujus tamen studio et industria editæ sunt Concordantiæ Magnæ quæ Anglicanæ vocantur."

[5] See Daniel Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, London, 1852, vol. iii, part i, p. 56, note; Thomas de Farnylawe's will, 1378, includes this provision: "quod concordanciæ domini mei una cum Biblia sua essent cathenatæ in porticu boriali ecclesiæ beati Nicholai Novi Castri ad usum communem pro anima mea."

concordances to the Vulgate gave Christians an advantage in theological discussions, compiled one to the Hebrew Bible.

In Latin the word *concordantiæ*, a mediæval formation from the participle of the verb *concordare*, was and still is used in the plural in this sense, because each group of citations was thought of as a *concordantia*. The word might properly indicate any kind of agreement between the passages grouped together, and it is, in fact, applied in various senses. About 1130 Gratian of Bologna wrote the *Concordantia Discordantium Canonum*;[1] and similarly the English word *concordance* has sometimes been used for what is more commonly called a *harmony*, — an arrangement of different texts in parallel columns to bring out their points of agreement.[2] Closely allied to this is another, likewise obsolete, use of the word, to denote marginal references to parallel texts; for instance, on the title-page to Coverdale's New Testament, printed at Antwerp in 1538: "The New Testament . . . wyth a true concordaunce in the margent."[3] Returning to present usage, we find that many authorities make a distinction between word concordances and subject concordances. In the *Concordantiæ Morales*, ascribed to St. Antony of Padua (1195–1231),[4] a work which may perhaps be said to contain the germ of the concordance idea, texts are cited in groups according to subject, with references; and the groups are arranged without regard to their

[1] See *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden*, edition cited, p. ix, note.

[2] The French word *concordance* is also used in this sense. The *Nouveau Larousse* gives: "Ouvrage montrant la suite et l'accord des quatre textes évangéliques." Littré has an equivalent definition, and also the *Grande Encyclopédie*: "Concordance ou Concorde, ou encore Harmonie des quatre évangiles."

[3] See *British Museum Catalogue* and *New English Dictionary*; cf. Bindseil, *op. cit.*, p. 718. A Bible printed at Nuremberg in 1478 has this title: *Biblia Latina cum canonibus evangelistarumque concordantiis Menardi Monachi*; one printed at Basel in 1491 has the "marginal concordance" throughout (utriusque testamenti concordantiis illustrata), as did also the original edition of Luther's translation of the Bible. In Petrocchi, *Novo Dizionario Universale*, the only pertinent definition s.v. Concordanza is: "Concordanze della Bibbia. I riscontri che si citano e si spiegano l'un coll' altro."

[4] Published by J. de la Haye, *Sancti Francisci Assisiatis nec non S. Antonii Paduani Opera Omnia*, Pedeponti prope Ratisbonam, 1739, pp. 609–744. See also J. M. Neale, *Mediæval Preachers*, London, 1856, p. xxxviii; and an article in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, vol. xxix, pp. 451–459 (1847).

wording, in arbitrary order, not alphabetically. A work printed in 1490, called *Concordantiæ Minores*, and the *Index copiosissimus Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, published by R. Stephanus in 1540, are practically subject indexes.[1] In German such works are called *Realconcordanzen*, as distinguished from *Verbalconcordanzen* (or *-konkordanzen*);[2] and in spite of its ambiguity the term *real* has been taken over by some English lexicographers. Thus the *New English Dictionary*, after quoting Johnson's definition, — "A book which shows in how many texts of scripture any word occurs,"— continues thus: "This is sometimes denominated a *verbal* concordance as distinguished from a *real* concordance, which is an index of *subjects* or *topics*." The same distinction is made by the *Century Dictionary*: "A *verbal concordance* consists of an alphabetical list of the principal words. . . . A *real concordance* is an alphabetical index of subjects." In Italian[3] we find a similar distinction, but the French dictionaries, and some English ones, do not make it. It is, of course, perfectly natural for the Germans, who have not only *Realschulen* but *Realwörterbücher*, to apply the word *real* to concordances. But the use of the English word *real*, as quoted above, is objectionable, because, if not actually ambiguous in this connection, it at least seems to imply that the mere subject index is better entitled to the name *concordance* than is the immense majority of the books which are actually so called.[4]

[1] See Bindseil, *op. cit.*, pp. 711–712.

[2] See Bindseil, *loc. cit.*; Brockhaus' *Konversations-Lexikon*, s.v. Konkordanz: "Man unterscheidet hier Verbal- und Realkonkordanzen . . . die letztern geben eine geordnete Zusammenstellung aller auf einen bestimmten Gedanken oder Gegenstand bezüglichen Stellen." Cf. Hanff, *Biblische Real- und Verbal-Concordanz*, Stuttgart, 1828–1834.

[3] Boccardo, *Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana* (6. ed.), Torino, 1878, vol. vi, s.v. Concordanza: "Chiamasi cosí quel libro che dà in ordine alfabetico le parole della sacra Scrittura colla citazione dei luoghi in cui ciascuna di esse si trova. Questa è la definizione sostanziale della concordanza, dovendosi considerare come accidentali ed accessorii gl' indici, per esempio, de' nomi proprii, i significati che, giusta l'opinione dell' autore, ponno avere i vocaboli, ecc. . . . Vi sono anche le concordanze delle cose, . . . comprendendo tutte le materie trattate dalla Bibbia." The definition in Tommaseo-Bellini, *Dizionario* (1865), applies only to verbal concordances. The *Diccionario Enciclopedico Hispano-Americano* defines *concordancias* (plural) as: "Indice alfabetico de todas las palabras de la Biblia con todas las citas," etc.

[4] *Real* is sometimes used, it is true, more or less in the German sense. See *New English Dictionary*, s.v. Real, where some of the quotations contrast *verbal* and

The word *concordance* is appropriate to a work which shows agreement in meaning as well as in words, and to some extent a purely verbal concordance serves as a subject index. But this does not justify using the word for an ordinary index of topics, without quotations, as has sometimes been done.[1]

The first concordance in English to any part of the Bible was published about 1540 by Thomas Gybson, with this title: *The Concordance of the New Testament, most necessary to be had in the hands of all soche as desire the communication of any place contained in the New Testament.* The first one to the whole Bible was compiled by John Marbeck, and printed in 1550; its title reads: *Concordāce: that is to saie, a work wherein by the ordre of the letters of the A. B. C. ye maie redely finde any worde conteigned in the whole Bible so often as it is there expressed or mencioned.* In this book, a folio of nearly nine hundred pages, the English words were accompanied by their Latin equivalents and by citations of the context. Marbeck had been working on it since the appearance of the so-called Matthew's Bible in 1537, when in 1543 his papers were seized, and with three other "Windsor-men" he was tried for heresy and condemned to death. The three others were executed, but Marbeck was pardoned, and ultimately finished his concordance. During his trial he gave an interesting account of how he came to undertake the work, thus reported by Foxe:[2]

Then said the bishop of Salisbury, "Whose help hadst thou in setting forth this book?" "Truly, my lord," quoth he, "no help at all." "How couldst thou," quoth the bishop, "invent such a book, or know what a Concordance meant, without an instructor?" "I will tell your lordship," quoth he, "what instructor I had to begin it. When Thomas Matthewe's

real; e.g. Purchas (1613): "not onely verball, but reall commendations" (i.e. "consisting of actual things"; a rare and obsolete use); cf. Whately (1845): "real definitions, which unfold the nature of the thing."

[1] For instance, Wheeler's so-called *Concordance to "The Spectator,"* London, 1897, is nothing more or less than a subject index, and its preface gives an excellent description of what such a work should be.

[2] John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments*, ed. Townsend and Cattley, London, 1838, vol. v, pp. 464–497: "The Trouble and Persecution of four Windsor-men, Robert Testwood, Henry Filmer, Anthony Peerson, and John Marbeck;" see p. 482. Marbeck was from 1541 organist at St. George's Chapel, Windsor. See also *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. Marbeck; and Grove's *Dictionary of Music*, s.v. Merbecke.

Bible first came out in print, I was much desirous to have one of them; and being a poor man, not able to buy one of them, determined with myself to borrow one amongst my friends, and to write it forth. And when I had written out the five books of Moses in fair great paper, and was entered into the book of Joshua, my friend, Master Turner, chanced to steal upon me unawares, and seeing me writing out the Bible, asked me what I meant thereby. And when I told him the cause: "Tush!" quoth he, "thou goest about a vain and tedious labour. But this were a profitable work for thee, to set out a concordance in English."

"A concordance," said I; "what is that?"

Then he told me it was a book to find out any word in the whole Bible by the letter, and that there was such a one in Latin already.

Then I told him I had had no learning to go about such a thing.

"Enough," quoth he, "for that matter, for it requireth not so much learning as diligence. And seeing thou art so painful a man, and one that cannot be unoccupied, it were a good exercise for thee."

Although not the most important element in securing his condemnation, Marbeck's Concordance was evidently a mysterious and somewhat dangerous affair in the eyes of his judges:

Taking up a quire of the Concordance in his hand . . . , "I cannot tell," quoth the bishop, "but that the book is translated word for word out of the Latin Concordance"; and so began to declare to the rest of the council the nature of a Concordance, and how it was first compiled in Latin, by the great diligence of learned men for the ease of preachers; concluding with this reason, that if such a book should go forth in English, it would destroy the Latin tongue.[1]

In spite of the worthy bishop's fears, concordances multiplied both in Latin and in English. Although superseded now on account of various defects of design and execution, by far the most widely known of those in English is Alexander Cruden's *Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures*, which first appeared in 1737. In his preface Cruden thus defines the work:

A Concordance is a Dictionary, or an Index to the Bible, wherein all the words used through the inspired writings are ranged alphabetically, and the various places where they occur are referred to, to assist us in finding out passages, and comparing the several significations of the same word.

[1] Foxe, *loc. cit.*, p. 474.

This is a clear statement of the nature and purpose of the book in question, and likewise, except in limiting such a work to the Bible, of concordances in general. Richardson's *English Dictionary* (1838) adopts Cruden's definition literally. Kersey's *New English Dictionary* (2d ed., 1713) gives: "A Concordance, a general Table of all the Words in the Holy Bible." N. Bailey's *Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (4th ed., 1728) has: "Concordance, an Agreement: Also a general alphabetical Index of all the Words in the Bible." Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary* (1st ed., 1755) gives three definitions: "(1) agreement; (2) a book which shews in how many texts of scripture any word occurs; (3) a concord in grammar. . . . It is not now in use in this sense."

The English word *concordance* is still used in the general sense of "agreement";[1] but it is not now used for grammatical agreement, marginal references to parallel passages, or harmony of the gospels. When used as the name of a book, it means, according to its history in English and in most other languages, an index of words accompanied by citations of the passages in which they occur; or, from a slightly different point of view, an alphabetical classification of the passages in a book according to prominent words in each passage. This is the sense in which the word is used hereafter in this paper. If the words are accompanied merely by references, with no citation of context, we have, properly speaking, not a concordance but an *index verborum*.[2] An index of subjects is still less entitled to be called a concordance, for its nature and purpose are entirely distinct; it is highly desirable that this German usage, unfortunately imported into English to add more confusion where some existed already, should be promptly suppressed.[3]

[1] A recent instance is found in an article by the late W. W. Newell, in *Journal of American Folk-lore*, vol. xix, p. 273: "The theme, in spite of a general concordance, exhibits many variations."

[2] This distinction is clearly made by President B. I. Wheeler in an admirable article in Johnson's *Universal Cyclopedia*, s.v. Dictionary.

[3] Dr. Schincke in Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, vol. xix, Leipzig, 1829, declares that mere "Verbalconcordanzen" are of very limited usefulness: "Sie müssen zugleich über die Bedeutung der Wörter, den Sinn ganzer . . . Stellen entscheiden, lexikographisch zu Werk gehen, und die einstimmigen (concordanten) Gedanken, Lehren, und Vorschriften, nebst . . . Erläuterungen zusammenstellen,

Such a work may be used in three ways: in the first place, as a word index for locating passages which are known; secondly, as a language index for discovering passages which are unknown, and in general for various kinds of linguistic investigation; thirdly, to some extent, as a subject index. It is evident, however, that a verbal concordance can serve but imperfectly as a subject index; the significant topics do not always correspond to particular words, and a large part of the words included in a concordance would be a useless encumbrance in an index of topics. Accordingly, this feature must be regarded as incidental, and should not be allowed to interfere with more obvious purposes. The chief use of concordances to the Bible has perhaps been in the locating of texts and in the finding of parallel passages; but their usefulness for linguistic investigation was early appreciated. During the Council of Basel (1431–1449) it was found to be a defect of the concordances then available that the declinable words alone were indexed. Theological discussions sometimes turned on the exact meaning of an adverb or a preposition; accordingly, a concordance of indeclinable particles was prepared, and it was printed at Basel in 1496 as a part of Conrad's concordance (which had been printed at Strassburg in 1470 and in 1475). Strong's *Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (New York, 1894) has more than four hundred thousand quotations in its main part, followed by over two hundred thousand references, without quotations, for some forty-seven particles. Mrs. H. H. Furness, in her *Concordance to Shakespeare's Poems* (Philadelphia, 1874), includes a quotation for every occurrence of every word, even for the particles. Such completeness seems to be, on the whole, a positive disadvantage, on account of the disproportionate amount of space required.

oder Realconcordanzen geben." This, to the present writer's mind, carries us far from the proper function of a concordance, and equally far from the subject index, which is sometimes unjustifiably called a concordance. A satisfactory definition is given in the *Universal Lexicon Aller Wissenschafften und Künste*, vol. vi, Halle und Leipzig, 1732–1733: "Übereinstimmung, dahero wird die Concordantz-Bibel genennet, welche die concordante und einander gleichstimmende Wörter und Sprüche nach der Ordnung des Alphabets und Biblischen Bücher darstellet, also, dass man durch deren Beyhülffe gar leichte finden kan, wo dieselbe geschrieben stehen, it. die gleichlaudende Sprüche, oder Loca parallela." G. Büchner's *Biblische Real- und Verbal-Concordanzien* appeared at Jena in 1757.

When studying the use of pronouns or prepositions in any given work, the investigator must certainly rely on the text itself, however much assistance he may derive from a concordance. The course of procedure will doubtless properly vary in the case of different authors; and every maker of a concordance must carefully consider what words, if any, should be omitted entirely, or simply mentioned without references, and what words should be given with references but without quotation of context. As Cruden put it in the preface to his second edition, "Though it be called in the title-page, *A complete Concordance*, poor sinful man can do nothing absolutely perfect and complete, and therefore the word *complete* is only to be taken in a comparative sense."

It may seem that in some respects the concordance trespasses on the territory of the lexicon. In a lexicon, however, every word is cited, but by no means every occurrence of every word; under each heading the different meanings of the word are shown, with typical quotations classified according to meaning. The lexicon may fail us, then, when we wish to locate a given passage, and it is almost certain to fail us when we wish to locate every occurrence of a given word. The chief stress being laid on meaning, the editor of a lexicon must continually make decisions in interpretation, and classify the quotations in accordance with these decisions. This process should be avoided as much as possible in a concordance. Now, for some authors a special glossary or lexicon would be more appropriate than a complete concordance. For instance, would it ever be advisable to prepare a concordance to Boccaccio, to Ariosto, or to Benvenuto Cellini? Probably not; but a lexicon of the language of each of these authors would be extremely instructive. On the other hand, for Petrarch's Latin works the most useful book of reference, assuming that a standard edition of the text was available, would be a subject index, which might be made to cover the Italian poems also. For Petrarch's Italian poems alone a subject index would be of comparatively little use; a special lexicon would be of considerable value, but unquestionably more useful than either would be a concordance. This last may serve to some extent as a substitute for the others, while it has functions of its own which no other kind of book can adequately fulfill. Since

concordances and various other sorts of reference books for all of Dante's works, Latin as well as Italian, have already been published or announced for speedy publication, no book of the kind is so urgently needed for any other Italian author as for Petrarch. Students of Dante and of all later Italian poets will find such a book useful, not only as a simple word index to the *Canzoniere*, but as a basis for various investigations in language, literature, and poetics. It must be remembered that in some respects Petrarch exercised more influence over succeeding poets than Dante did. As Dr. Everett has said:

> Of his immense influence on the language and literature of Italy the evidence is plain, and the estimate can hardly be exaggerated. He fixed the language of Italian poets in words, in phrases, in form, in tone. It is said — and as far as a foreigner can judge it is true — that there is no word in Petrarch which is not in good use to-day.[1]

In a desire to meet an obvious need, then, the writer of this paper has undertaken the preparation of a concordance to the Italian writings of Petrarch.[2] Considerable progress has already been made; and that the work, when completed, will be of use to a wider circle than students of Italian, is indicated by these words of Professor Cook: "It requires but a glance of the mind to see that when Dr. McKenzie's Petrarch concordance is published, the study of Elizabethan lyric poetry will be greatly facilitated."[3]

[1] William Everett, *The Italian Poets since Dante*, New York, 1904, p. 18. Compare a remark of Augusto Conti, quoted and discussed by Fiammazzo at the beginning of the preface to his *Vocabolario-Concordanza*, cited below; speaking of Petrarch, he said: "Scrittore in lingua volgare, pressochè tutte le parole di lui, pressochè tutti i modi son vivi ancora; e in ciò supera Dante, che supera lui di molto nella ricchezza."

[2] The preparation of a Petrarch concordance was announced in *The Nation*, June 22, 1905; *The Athenæum*, June 17, 1905; and the *Rassegna Bibliografica della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. xiii, p. 258.

[3] Albert S. Cook, *The Concordance Society*, in *Modern Language Notes*, vol. xxii, p. 33 (February, 1907). Professor Cook points out the manifold uses of concordances, and makes a plea for their multiplication, following out the ideas already expressed in his book, *The Higher Study of English*, Boston, 1906, p. 95. He has given hearty encouragement to the project of a Petrarch concordance, although the Concordance Society, organized under his initiative and with him as its first president, has decided for the present to confine its activities to English authors.

It is evidently a matter of importance to determine the best method of arranging a concordance; and yet criticisms of the one recently edited by Professor Sheldon, as well as the wide differences of method among concordance makers, show that on this subject there is no general agreement among scholars. First of all, and continually, it must be borne in mind that the editor is not presenting the results of an investigation, but a work which will be referred to, whether incidentally or systematically, for certain information; hence he should keep his own personal judgment as much as possible in the background, and should arrange the material in the most natural and practical way. In a word, the arrangement most convenient for practical use is the most scholarly. The editor should then introduce no system of classification except on a universally accepted basis, such as the order of the alphabet,[1] or, as the case may be, the actual order of occurrence in the text. Any departure from these natural methods of arrangement, any system of arbitrary grouping, at once involves individual judgment, — hence difference of opinion, — with the result of more or less inconvenience to the user of the book. Subject to exception in special cases where some particular purpose is held in view, these principles will surely be generally accepted as applying alike to the concordance, the index, and the dictionary. Works in which some system of classification is an end in itself belong to an entirely different class.[2] But

[1] An example of an arrangement which is only partly alphabetical, and consequently is inconvenient and exasperating to use, is the index of the first lines of Petrarch's poems in Rigutini's edition (Milano, 1896); the references are classified, like the poems in the text, in three parts, and in each part they are again classified according to the form of the poem, — and yet this contrivance is called "Indice alfabetico del Canzoniere"! In the index to Scartazzini's edition (Leipzig, 1883) all the *sonetti* are arranged alphabetically, then all the *canzoni*, then the *sestine*, etc. In the Mestica and Carducci-Ferrari editions all the first lines are arranged alphabetically in the index, as they should be, without regard to the form of the poem.

[2] These principles are strangely violated in the *Oxford Concordance*, printed as part of the appendix in several of the Oxford editions of the Bible. A prefatory note states that as this concordance "is intended to be used conjointly with the Oxford Index, which precedes it in this volume, all references to proper names, etc., included in the latter have been designedly omitted from the former." Thus *almonds* and *aloes* are found only in the index, with references, but no quotations

other questions, not so easily solved, force themselves upon the attention of every concordance user and demand an answer from every concordance maker. What words shall be chosen for headings? How shall the quotations and references be arranged under each heading? These purely practical questions involve principles which should be, as far as possible, agreed upon. As their interest for the present writer is largely in connection with his own work on the Petrarch concordance, they may perhaps be most conveniently discussed by means of a comparison of several reference books for the study of Dante, particularly the two concordances already published by the Dante Society.

Previous to the publication of Dr. Fay's *Concordance* several kinds of books, none of them really adequate for the purpose, could be used to some extent to locate passages in the *Divine Comedy*. These were the *rimario*, or index of rhymes; the vocabulary, or lexicon, in so far as it gave references to the text; and the index of proper names. During the sixteenth century several *rimari* were printed; the earliest was apparently that of Pellegrino Moretto,[1] which included Petrarch as well as Dante. Others were produced by Falco (1533), Bonnontio (1556), and Ruscelli (1559, reprinted 1754 and 1858).[2] In 1602 Carlo Noci published at Naples his *Rimario di tutte le disinenze della Commedia di Dante Alighieri;* this was revised by Volpi for the edition of the *Divine Comedy* which appeared at Padua in 1726–1727, and it is the basis of most of the

of context; while *air* and *alien* are only in the concordance, with their context; but for many words, as *access*, the same references are given in both places. As if this were not enough, the concordance is followed by a *Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names*, which includes some names omitted from the index (e.g. *Abagtha*), although many are repeated.

[1] Colomb de Batines, *Bibliografia dantesca*, Prato, 1845, vol. i, pp. 280 ff., mentions an edition of 1528, printed in Venice (*Rimario di tutte le cadentie di Dante e del Petrarca*), and several later editions. That given by Koch, in the Cornell *Catalogue of the Dante Collection*, is of 1533, and has the author's name in the form "Moreto."

[2] See Koch, *op. cit.*, under these names. Colomb de Batines, *loc. cit.*, mentions: G. Miniati da Prato, *Rimario di tutte le desinenze della Commedia . . . Da trovare qual si voglia rima, e mediante quella ogni cosa, che sia in tutte le tre Cantiche*, Firenze, 1604.

rimari since published.[1] In some editions the entire verses are quoted, in others only references are given under each rhyme. In the *Rime del Petrarca secondo la lezione del Marsand* (Padova, 1829) there are an index of proper names and a *rimario* of Petrarch, with the entire verses quoted; and also a *rimario*, with references only, to the poems of Dante, Berni, Ariosto, and Tasso. In a *rimario* the lines of the poem are grouped according to rhyme, the heading of each group being the last accented vowel and the following letters, which are common to all the lines of the group. It is usual to arrange the headings alphabetically, and the lines under each heading in the order in which they occur in the text. Another method is followed by Dr. Luigi Polacco in his *Rimario perfezionato della Divina Commedia*, the lines being arranged under each heading according to the letters that precede the accented vowel. This method seems to some critics very far from being an improvement, since it scatters the lines which go together in the text.[2]

A *rimario* is evidently of service in finding passages only when one knows the end of a line. The same is true of the so-called *Concordanza Speciale della Divina Commedia*, also by Dr. Polacco, thus described by its subtitle: "Repertorio di tutti i versi del poema ordinati alfabeticamente secondo le loro parole finali";[3] this work and the *Indice alfabetico dei versi della "Divina Commedia"* (Firenze, 1904) by Francesco Lori, so far as they go, are true concordances, — that is, for one word in each line. Similarly uncertain aid is furnished by a lexicon or an index; all of these books are likely to fail just when they are most needed, and for some of the purposes of a concordance they are of no use whatever. In his edition of

[1] See Koch, *op. cit.*; W. C. Lane, *The Dante Collections in the Harvard College and Boston Public Libraries*, Cambridge, 1890, s.v. Rimario; and Colomb de Batines, *loc. cit.*

[2] This *Rimario perfezionato* was published in 1896, in the second edition of Scartazzini's "edizione minore" of the *Divina Commedia* (Milano, Hoepli), and in subsequent editions. It is severely criticised by Mr. Paget Toynbee, who says of it, in *Romania*, vol. xxv, pp. 331–332: "A more perverse arrangement it would be difficult to conceive." The first edition (1893) had the traditional *rimario* and index of names.

[3] Appended, together with an "Indice dei nomi propri e delle cose notabili," to the revised edition of Fraticelli's *Divina Commedia*, Firenze, 1898.

1726–1727 Volpi published, in addition to the *rimario* already mentioned, a copious index of words and one of proper names, with references and explanations. This edition, frequently reprinted, was very useful in its day, having its information arranged in form for ready reference, and not as a running commentary on the text. In the sixteenth century appeared several books purporting to be vocabularies of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, — *Le Tre Fontane* by Messer Nicolo Liburnio (Vinegia, 1526, etc.); the *Vocabulario di cinque mila vocabuli* by Fabrizio Luna (Napoli, 1536; cf. Colomb de Batines, *loc. cit.*); the *Vocabolario et grammatica* by Alberto Acharisio (or Accarigi; Venetia, 1543, 1550); *La Fabrica del mondo* by Francesco Alunno (Vinegia, 1548, etc.); and William Thomas, *Principal rules of the Italian grammer, with a Dictionarie for the better vnderstandynge of Boccace, Pethrarcha and Dante* (London, 1567; original edition, 1550). In 1852 appeared at Leipzig the well-known and widely used *Vocabolario dantesco ou Dictionnaire critique et raisonné de la Divine Comédie* by L. G. Blanc (Italian version by Carbone, Firenze, 1859), which is not yet entirely superseded; although antiquated, it is far superior to the works of Granata,[1] Castrogiovanni,[2] Gaddi Hercolani,[3] and Bobbio.[4] The *Manuale Dantesco* of Ferrazzi (5 vols., Bassano, 1865–1877), which contains valuable material for the study of Petrarch as well as Dante, is inconvenient for reference because of its unsystematic arrangement. G. Poletto's *Dizionario Dantesco* (7 vols., Siena, 1885–1887) deals with all of Dante's writings, but is incomplete and inaccurate. Mr. Paget Toynbee has announced a Vocabulary to Dante's Italian works; and his *Dictionary of Proper Names and Notable Matters in the Works of Dante* (Oxford, 1898) is invaluable; so far as the proper names go, it practically serves as a concordance. In 1894, pending the publication of the *Dictionary*, Mr. Paget Toynbee published in the *Eleventh Annual Report of the Dante Society* an *Index of Proper Names in the Prose Works and Canzoniere of Dante;* and in the

[1] *Florilegio e Dizionario Dantesco*, Napoli, 1855.

[2] *Fraseologia poetica e Dizionario generale della Divina Commedia*, Palermo, 1861.

[3] *Vocabolario Enciclopedico Dantesco*, Bologna, 1876 (never completed).

[4] *Prontuario del Dantofilo . . . con Indice-rimario*, ecc., Roma, 1892.

Oxford Dante (first edition, 1894) he furnishes a similar index for the complete works. Indexes had previously appeared with certain separate works, as Giuliani's *Convito* (Firenze, 1875) and Casini's *Vita Nuova* (Firenze, 1885 and 1891). Other dictionaries of names are those by D. Bocci,[1] F. Locock,[2] G. Coen,[3] and G. L. Passerini.[4]

None of the books just mentioned can serve adequately as a concordance. On its appearance in 1888, Dr. Fay's *Concordance* was everywhere welcomed. Whatever defects it may have, it still holds uncontested its position as the only true concordance to the *Divine Comedy*, and in its own field it is not likely to be superseded for many years to come. Among words of appreciation from many eminent scholars who have used it, these may be quoted: "I have often thought that the most generally useful commentary on the *Divina Commedia* in existence is the invaluable concordance of Dr. Fay."[5] Attempts to meet the need of such a book had, however, been made before.[6] In 1886 there were printed at Girgenti two *fascicoli* of *La Concordanza Dantesca*, by F. Vassallo-Paleologo, including the words *a-alcuno*. The work was planned on too ambitious a scale, with quotations of several lines, sometimes of several consecutive *terzine*, as the context of one word; if it had been completed, its enormous and unnecessary bulk would have made it too cumbrous for convenient use.

[1] *Dizionario storico, geografico, universale della D.C.*, Torino, 1873.

[2] *Biographical Guide to the D.C.*, London, 1874.

[3] *Personaggi storici e mitologici rammentati nella D.C.*, Firenze, 1895.

[4] *Dizionarietto Dantesco*, Firenze, 1904. In spite of its attractive appearance, this little book is scarcely worthy of its distinguished author. It gives brief notes and sometimes bibliographies on the names of persons and places in the *Divine Comedy*. Persons who have two names appear twice, with different if not actually inconsistent statements; for instance, the author of the *Trésor* appears under Brunetto and under Latini, Dante's first friend under Cavalcanti and under Guido, and so on. This perverse arrangement wastes space, so far as the articles repeat one another; it misleads the reader, so far as they supplement one another.

[5] E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, first series, p. 45 (Oxford, 1896). Cf. Scartazzini, *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, s.v. Concordanza (vol. i), and vol. iii, p. xxix.

[6] Cf. Koch, *Catalogue*, s.v. La Rosa and Russo. According to Colomb de Batines, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 290, 294, two concordances and a complete verbal index to the *D.C.* exist in manuscript.

In 1900 Scartazzini published[1] a *Concordanza della Divina Commedia*, based entirely on Dr. Fay's work and not on the text, as he himself admits: "Inutile dire che il monumentale lavoro del *Fay* fu essenzialmente il fondamento della mia *Concordanza*, nonostante la gran diversità di sistema." There are no citations of context, but under each heading references are given in the order in which they occur in the text, not in Dr. Fay's arbitrary order. Copying the references and rearranging them is all that Scartazzini contributed of his own; and the results, as has been clearly pointed out elsewhere,[2] are sometimes very curious; for since it follows Dr. Fay blindly, and therefore the Witte text, the *Concordanza* does not always agree with Scartazzini's own text, printed in the same volume! The work is really an index of words and forms, — a *spoglio*, as it is sometimes called, — rather than a concordance.[3] A far more important work is Scartazzini's *Enciclopedia Dantesca; dizionario critico e ragionato di quanto concerne la vita e le opere di Dante Alighieri* (two volumes paged continuously; Milano, 1896–1899). This was intended to contain, with other material, a complete vocabulary of all Dante's works; but it is very incomplete, especially for the minor works. Had he lived, the author would doubtless have remedied many defects, such as the omission of several hundred words. After his death, the task was undertaken by Professor A. Fiammazzo, who found it advisable, as a first step toward revision of the *Enciclopedia*, to issue a complete *Vocabolario-Concordanza*

[1] As an appendix to the revised first volume of his larger edition of the *Divina Commedia* (Leipzig, Brockhaus). See his preface, p. ix.

[2] By A. Fiammazzo, in the *prefazione* to his *Vocabolario-Concordanza delle Opere Latine e Italiane di Dante Alighieri* (= Scartazzini, *Enciclopedia Dantesca*, vol. iii, Milano, 1905), which is to be mentioned presently.

[3] Not only does the *Concordanza* occasionally disagree with the text, but it also perpetuates whatever omissions or errors there are in Dr. Fay's work; for instance, *senno* for *seno* (*Inf.*, 28. 6). Different words spelled alike are kept separate, as the verb and the noun *domando*, but often with nothing to indicate which is which; and, in fact, one of the references for *domando* (*Purg.*, 4. 18) is put among the verbs when it should be among the nouns, — a mistake which can be detected in Dr. Fay's *Concordance* by reading the context, but which might mislead a reader where there is no context. Once, at least (*Inf.*, 19. 78), *domando* in the *Concordanza*, as in Fay and in the Oxford Dante, contrasts with *dimando* in Scartazzini's text. For more data, see Fiammazzo, *loc. cit.*

delle Opere Latine e Italiane di Dante Alighieri (pp. lxvii, 667). This useful and compendious work, with complete references for all except a number of common words, but with no quotations of context, is practically an index or digest of a concordance. The Latin and the Italian words follow one another indiscriminately in one alphabet, being distinguished by different type; references to inflectional forms are grouped separately, but are all put under the head-word. The text followed is that of Dr. Moore (Oxford, 1894), except in the case of the *de Vulgari Eloquentia*, where the critical text of Professor Pio Rajna (Firenze, 1896) is used; many variant readings from other editions are included. A few weeks after the appearance of this book the Dante Society issued its *Concordanza delle Opere Italiane in Prosa e del Canzoniere di Dante Alighieri, a cura di E. S. Sheldon coll' aiuto di A. C. White* (Oxford, 1905; pp. viii, 740), which seems to the present writer in almost every particular a model of what such a book should be. Professor Sheldon himself, in the *Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Dante Society*, gave an account of it. The rest of this paper will be devoted chiefly to a discussion of certain points of difference between the Sheldon concordance and others, especially that of Dr. Fay, with an attempt to determine the principles that are involved. These two concordances, although sufficiently alike to stand together in contrast to all the other reference books for the study of Dante that have yet been published, nevertheless follow different methods of arrangement. The method used by Professor Sheldon is followed essentially by the editors of the forthcoming concordance to the Latin writings, the publication of which will complete the undertaking begun more than twenty years ago, of furnishing concordances to all the works of Dante.

In the Fay concordance, every separate form that occurs in the text appears as a separate heading. Thus the citations of the verb *uscire*, a few more than one hundred in number, are divided among thirty-three separate headings; *vedere*, used nearly eight hundred times in the *Divine Comedy*, appears under seventy-six headings; the adjective *bello*, of which seven different forms are used, has accordingly seven headings. The forms with the final vowel are separated from those without it, as *bene* and *ben;* each of these forms

being subdivided into two headings, according to whether the word is used as noun or adverb. In the Sheldon concordance, on the other hand, all the citations of a verb are arranged under the infinitive, and similarly each adjective and noun under a single heading, without distinction of the inflectional form or the presence or absence of the final vowel; the citations under each heading being given in the order in which they occur in the text. Which of these methods is preferable?

For the purpose of locating quotations the analytical method of Fay seems at first sight more convenient, provided one knows the exact form of the word sought. It is unquestionably easier to turn directly to a verb form like *esca*, *escon*, *uscendo*, *uscissi*, or *uscivan*, in its alphabetical position, than to search for it among a hundred quotations all grouped under the heading *uscire*. This is particularly true in the case of a person ignorant of the Italian language; but such a person could hardly expect to find an Italian concordance arranged with reference to his occasional use, and if unsuccessful at first, he should continue his search by looking up other words in the quotation before him. Is it certain, however, that even for the locating of words or phrases, the method of giving a separate heading for every form is always the most convenient? In looking up a quotation which is floating indistinctly through one's mind, or which is variously spelled in different editions, it may sometimes be impossible to find the particular word form under which it appears in the concordance; whereas, if all the forms are grouped under one heading, the reader turns directly to that, and finds the passage with little delay. We are now considering concordances with quotations; simple verbal indexes like those of Scartazzini and Fiammazzo present a somewhat different aspect. A concise alphabetical list of all forms, with references, certainly has its function, although a less important one than that of a true concordance; and Scartazzini's so-called *Concordanza* (in which the headings correspond exactly to those of Fay), if it had been more accurately made and if certain information had been added, would have been a very useful work. The method of arrangement in Fiammazzo's *Vocabolario-Concordanza* is different from either of the methods just described: here all the references for any one word

are put under a single heading, as in a dictionary; but under this heading the references are arranged in groups according to the particular inflectional forms of the word under treatment. This method also, in the case of an index without quotations, has obvious advantages.[1] It would be possible, of course, to put all the references under one heading, and still insert the inflectional forms in their alphabetical positions, with cross references. This scheme would secure the advantages of the dictionary arrangement, besides offering assistance (which those who did not need it could disregard) to investigators whose knowledge of the language was deficient; and at the same time it would furnish an alphabetical list of all the forms in the text. Probably all irregular forms, at least, should be so given; but in a concordance with quotations all the forms are naturally displayed, and the large amount of extra space that would be required in repeating them would hardly result in adequate gain.

We have seen, then, that the dictionary method of arranging references is never seriously inconvenient in a concordance with citations of context for each reference, even from the standpoint of simply locating passages in which one or more prominent words are known. How is it when we consider the other functions of a concordance? In this connection we may quote from an interesting review by Mr. Paget Toynbee [2] regarding the Sheldon concordance:

> We decidedly disapprove of the abandonment of the accepted concordance method of giving as head-words every separate part of verb, substantive, or adjective, in favour of the dictionary method, viz. that of registering all verbal forms under the head of the infinitive, and of ignoring as headings the inflected forms of substantives and adjectives. We cannot see that any advantage is gained by this arrangement, while the disadvantages are obvious. For instance, in order to find a particular passage, say,

[1] The great merit of Fiammazzo's work, as he himself states, is that it gives in one small volume Dante's complete vocabulary. The number of words for which no references are given is much greater than in Fay or Sheldon, and in some cases the arrangement is open to criticism; for instance, under the leading *uscire* we find: "*uscire* e le sue forme, spesso [vedi *escire*]." Under *escire*, which of course does not occur in Dante as an infinitive, complete references are given for all the forms of *uscire* that begin with *esc-*, — as if they were less regular than the forms beginning with *usc-*, which are omitted.

[2] *Modern Language Review*, vol. i, pp. 155–157 (January, 1906).

in which the word *ragiona* occurs (as in the phrase *ragiona il fine*), it is necessary to search through more than two pages of the concordance under the heading *ragionare*; whereas if there had been a heading *ragiona*, it would only have been necessary to glance through about a third of a page. Again, to verify a quotation in which the word *ode* occurs, one has to turn to *udire*, under which heading there are more than a page and a half of entries.

A similar statement is made by Professor Fiammazzo in a review [1] of the same concordance; he naturally prefers the arrangement used by himself in his own work, but adds that it is convenient to have the same material differently arranged in different works of reference.

Now, in the first place, it is hardly accurate to speak of either method as "the accepted concordance method." To be sure, the concordances to English authors, and those to the Bible in English, follow in a general way, though not consistently,[2] the method of giving separate headings for the inflectional forms; so also do Dunbar's concordances to the *Odyssey* (1880) and to Aristophanes (1883), and Prendergast's to the *Iliad* (1869). But Bindseil's concordance to Pindar,[3] and most of those to the Bible in other languages than English,[4] are arranged on the plan of a dictionary.

[1] *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, vol. xii (1905), pp. 343–347: "Non mi accieca l'amor paterno se affermo qui preferire l'ordine grammaticale da me offerto nel *Vocabolario-Concordanza* per le forme flessionali, ecc."

[2] E.g. Bradshaw, *Concordance to Milton*, London, 1894, has a heading for every form; Bartlett, *Concordance to Shakespeare*, does not separate singulars and plurals, but puts under the heading *look*, for instance, singular and plural of both noun and verb, arranging all quotations in textual order, while *looked*, *lookest*, etc., have separate headings. Crawford, *A Concordance to the Works of Thomas Kyd*, Louvain, 1906 (first part), puts singulars and plurals under one heading, but in groups; thus under *father* come all the quotations of *father*, then those of *father's*, then *fathers*, then *fathers'*; and similarly under *grow* we find first that form, then *grows*, while *groweth*, *grew*, etc., have separate headings. It is interesting to note that Mr. Crawford publishes his concordance mainly in order to enable others to test his conclusions as to the authorship of certain disputed works. Cruden gives separate headings for each form, and also for various groups of words, as *hand*, *at hand*, *hand of God*, *left-hand*, *mighty hand*, etc.

[3] H. E. Bindseil, *Concordantiæ omnium vocum carminum Pindari ad modum concordantiarum Biblicarum primum elaboratæ*, Berolini, 1875. Cf. his *Concordantiarum Homericarum specimen*, Halis, 1867.

[4] See, for instance, the standard concordance to the Vulgate, by Dutripon; and the remarkable one, which is still widely used, to the Septuagint, by Abraham

A writer in *The Nation*,[1] reviewing the Fay concordance, says:

Whether this method of indexing is better than that of Blanc, who puts inflections and other forms under the theme form, is still an open question. To the present writer it seems that it is not. One uses a concordance to find a passage from some word which serves as a clew, or else to see the various ways in which the author uses a word. In the first instance it is just as easy to look for an inflectional form under the theme word, and in the second instance it is much more convenient to find all the inflectional forms under a single theme form.

But whether or not there is an "accepted concordance method," when Mr. Paget Toynbee says, "We cannot see that any advantage is gained," he apparently ignores all the uses of a concordance except the single one of verifying references. If a student wishes to find and compare all the varieties of form and meaning in a common irregular verb like *vedere*, will he prefer to search out seventy-six separate headings, and still be left with an uneasy feeling that yet more forms may be lurking undetected in dark corners of the alphabet, or will he prefer to find all the quotations containing the verb, brought together under one heading? If the verb in question be *uscire* or *udire*, he would have to turn to different parts of the book for some of the forms. For locating known quotations, then, either method of arrangement will serve, and there are certain advantages in each. In looking for unknown passages, however, the method advocated by Mr. Paget Toynbee is uncertain and inconvenient; and for the purposes of a subject index, in so far as these need to be considered in making a concordance, it is highly unsatisfactory. A concordance to the *Divine Comedy* will certainly be used for locating quotations, rather than for other purposes, oftener in proportion than one to Dante's minor works or

Tromm, *Concordantiæ Græcæ versionis vulgo dictæ LXX interpretum*, Amstelodami, 1718. Under the heading ἵστημι, for instance, one must look through some two hundred quotations before reaching a form that begins with ι; ἔστησεν, στήτω, εἰστήκει, etc., follow one another indiscriminately in the order in which they occur in the text. In Hebrew concordances the separation of inflectional forms is carried out very thoroughly, but in groups under a single heading; see S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiæ Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ*, Lipsiæ, 1896.

[1] Vol. xlvii, pp. 338–340 (October 25, 1888).

to the works of other Italian authors; it can be used, moreover, in connection with other reference books, like vocabularies, indexes, and *rimari*. A method of arrangement might, then, be entirely suitable here, which would not necessarily be the best in other cases. It may seem to some that the principles just stated do not apply with equal force to concordances in English. The present writer is convinced, however, that the system adopted by Professor Sheldon marks a distinct advance, and that any return to the system of giving a separate heading for every word form would be a step backward.

In a review [1] which is, on the whole, very appreciative of both the concordances published by the Dante Society, Professor Pio Rajna makes some criticisms of Professor Sheldon's method. In particular, he disapproves of putting together indiscriminately under one heading quotations in which a given word is used in different meanings:

> Alle differenze di valore per le singole parole non s'ha riguardo alcuno, mentre ne aveva tenuto conto il Fay. E cosí *abito*, vestito, ed *abito*, abitudine, *mezzodì*, ora del giorno, e *mezzodì*, plaga del cielo, *cessare*, smettere, e *cessare*, cansare, si frammischiano alla rinfusa. E si raccolgono promiscuamente sotto una bandiera, *tosto*, *certo*, avverbj, e *tosto*, *certo*, aggettivi. Ciò non è da approvare.

The principle here involved is to some extent the same as before. *Mezzodì* occurs twice in the minor works, once meaning "south" (*Conv.*, iii. 5. 118), and once meaning "noon" (*Conv.*, iv. 23. 146). Is it not in every way more convenient to find these two instances cited under one heading rather than under two? The difference of meaning is here obvious enough; but elsewhere (*Inferno*, xxiv. 3) the reading *mezzo dì* or *mezzodì* is variously interpreted as "half a day," "mid-day," and "south," [2] and in such a case is the concordance maker to insert a discussion of the question? This would be manifestly inexpedient; but whether he repeats the quotation under a second heading, or adopts one interpretation without comment and

[1] *Rassegna Bibliografica della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. xiii (1905), pp. 281–285.

[2] Cf. E. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, third series, p. 53. Fiammazzo gives both readings, but rejects Dr. Moore's reading *mezzodì* (= south).

ignores the other, he is more likely to confuse and mislead the reader than to help him. Even if the case were perfectly clear, the reader would have to make up his mind in which of two or more categories the word belonged, and then discover which heading in the concordance corresponded to which category, or else look through more than one heading; and all these processes would involve a loss of time and a greater mental effort, as compared with simply looking under one heading. It is true that the number of quotations under each heading is less if they are divided than if they are all combined in one; but in compensation it should be remembered that a reader generally has some idea as to the location of a passage sought, — whether it is in *Inferno* or *Paradiso*, for example, in a sonnet or in the prose of the *Convivio*, — and so does not have to examine all the quotations.

The natural way to arrange the quotations under one heading is evidently to put them in the order in which they occur in the text, and this is done in nearly all concordances. Dr. Fay devised a system of grouping either according to the alphabetical order of words in the context, or according to different shades of meaning. Thus under *cielo* he classifies the quotations according to the meanings: (1) sky; (2) heaven; (3) heavenly power; (4) a particular sphere. The objection to this system, even under the impossible condition that various people shall invariably agree in their judgment, is that a new classification necessarily comes into use with every word, so that when turning from one page to another the reader never knows what to expect, and in practice usually ends by ignoring the classification and simply hunting for his passage until he finds it.

These remarks do not, of course, apply to the separation of words spelled alike but etymologically different, — like *esca*, noun and verb, — or of words belonging to distinct categories, — like *domando*, noun and verb. Such words must be given under separate headings. But in such cases as *bene* (adverb and noun), *amico* (noun and adjective), *certo* (adjective and adverb), we have the identical word used in different categories, and in some cases belonging to one as much as to the other. Here the question should be decided on the basis of convenience. Some persons may, in general, prefer numerous headings and subdivisions; others will prefer as few as possible.

The point to be borne in mind in regard to a concordance is that if possible no division shall be introduced which involves the choosing between two allowable interpretations. Professor Pio Rajna presumably feels that it is unscholarly and unscientific to confuse distinctions of meaning or value in the use of a word by mingling all the instances of it under one heading. His criticism is, of course, entirely applicable in the case of a lexicon, whose function is precisely the differentiation and definition of usage and meaning. But in a concordance, as the writer has endeavored to make plain, the opposite principle holds. The user of a concordance should go to it to find the materials for making his own interpretations and classifications; he should not expect to find, and should not find, ready-made interpretations which may be a hindrance rather than a help.

Even though the method of arrangement be agreed upon, it is probable that every concordance will have its own individuality, and will to some extent reflect the personality of its editor. In addition to the special problems that may arise in different cases, there are many minor questions of a general nature, which will no doubt be decided differently by different editors. For instance, it may be said that, in general, each quotation ought not to occupy more than one line in the concordance, however much of the original text it may include; but within this limit there is often wide room for diversity in choosing the exact words to be quoted. The user of the concordance ought not to expect to find quotations so full that reference to the text will never be necessary; and yet, if the quotations are properly made, the concordance will often furnish all the information required as to the syntax, meaning, or location of words and phrases. The quotations should, so far as they go, be intelligible in themselves, and at least not misleading as to the sense of the passage from which they are taken. Speaking of Dr. Fay's concordance, the reviewer in *The Nation*, already quoted, declares that "everywhere throughout the book there are half pages of lines which one reads with real pleasure, so significant is each fragment of the whole, so sharp is the light thrown on the recurring word." Accordingly, the punctuation following the words quoted should be given, at least where it influences the sense. Professor

Sheldon has not done this, except in rare cases where he gives a question mark.[1] Dr. Fay gives question marks, but no other punctuation, at the end of a quotation. Why should not exclamation points be given as well; and also full stops, to indicate that the quotation ends a sentence? Similar problems in regard to methods of procedure multiply rapidly as soon as one undertakes a piece of work of the kind we are considering. In how far shall the variant readings of different editions be recognized? Where shall the line be drawn between giving too many and too few cross references? What words shall have no references given for them, and shall they be mentioned in their alphabetical position (as by Fay and Fiammazzo), or in a list by themselves (as by Sheldon)?

Several times we have spoken of putting references "in the order in which they occur in the text." If the text is the *Divine Comedy*, there is no question as to what this order is. In the case of Dante's minor works Professor Sheldon simply follows the order of one standard edition, distinguishing the poetic quotations from those in prose; and, as already noted, the same edition, although published in England, is followed by Professor Fiammazzo. In a collection of lyrical poems the order is necessarily arbitrary; but Petrarch has fortunately left us a manuscript of his *Canzoniere*, written under his own supervision, and partly with his own hand, shortly before his death.[2] From the order of the poems in this manuscript future editors are not likely to depart. Naturally, then, the concordance will be based on it; but shall the poems be taken just as they come, or with regard to their form, — all the sonnets, which form the largest part of the *Canzoniere*, followed by *canzoni*, *sestine*, *ballate*, and *madrigali*? The latter plan seems preferable for various

[1] See, for instance, s.v. Proprio. For quotations which should have the question mark, cf. "Perchè pur *cerchi* di vederla," and "Ecco, che . . . che avresti tu da *rispondere*." This latter quotation is also disconcerting from its syntactical incompleteness.

[2] The now famous Cod. Vat. Lat., 3195, of which the Società Filologica Romana published in 1904 a diplomatic or literal reproduction, edited by E. Modigliani. For the interesting history of this autograph manuscript, see Pierre de Nolhac, *La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*, Paris, 1887, pp. 279 ff.; A. Pakscher, *Aus einen Katalog des Fulvius Ursinus*, in *Zeitschrift f. Romanische Philologie*, vol. x, p. 205; and the introduction to the Carducci-Ferrari edition of the *Rime*.

reasons. The lyrics will be followed by the *Trionfi*, for which, unfortunately, we have no such secure basis. The only critical edition, published since the rediscovery of the autograph manuscript in 1886, which contains both the *Canzoniere* proper and the *Trionfi*, is that of Mestica,[1] which accordingly has been adopted as the standard for the concordance. In this edition the poems of each sort are numbered consecutively, but there is no running number indicating the order in which they occur. In other editions,[2] while printed in the same order, the poems are numbered continuously, without regard to their form. It will be possible to group the references according to Mestica's system, and at the same time to add to each reference a number indicating also its place in the continuous series. It is evidently important to distinguish clearly the form of the poem from which each quotation comes. Hence a double system of numbering is advisable, which will make the concordance easy to use with more than one edition. A comparative table will show corresponding references in other editions. In regard to the *Trionfi*, editors have not agreed on the order of the several *capitoli*, nor on the choice of a standard text among varying manuscripts. Here the obvious method is to follow Mestica as the standard for the concordance, but to add the variants of other important editions.

In preparing a text of Petrarch, even though we have the autograph, a considerable amount of editing is required; words must be separated, punctuation introduced, abbreviated words spelled out, various questions settled.[3] No edition yet published has even approached the ideal in producing a text that is at once faithful to the manuscript, consistent with itself, and at least reasonably

[1] *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca restituite nell' ordine e nella lezione del testo originario da* Giovanni Mestica, Firenze, 1896.

[2] The diplomatic edition already mentioned; *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca di su gli originali commentate da* G. Carducci e S. Ferrari, Firenze, 1899; *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca secondo la revisione ultima del poeta, a cura di* Giuseppe Salvo Cozzo, Firenze, 1904.

[3] Cf. Pio Rajna's remarks on "critical texts," in G. Mazzoni's *Avviamento allo Studio Critico delle Lettere Italiane*, 2.ª ed., Firenze, 1907, p. 217; and E. G. Parodi's review of the Salvo Cozzo edition cited above, in *Rassegna Bibliografica della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. xv, pp. 40–47.

legible to a modern reader. In the manuscript there is fragmentary and unsystematic punctuation, and, of course, no use of diacritical marks; forms like *desiare, allegrezza*, alternate with *disiare, alegrezza*. The Mestica and Carducci-Ferrari editions generally preserve the varieties of spelling, which in the older editions were normalized; but sometimes one keeps closer to the manuscript, sometimes the other. Thus C. writes *gioia, noia*, with ms., while M. writes *gioja, noja;* on the other hand, C. writes *ho, hai, ha*, while M. and the ms. omit the *h*-, M. writing *ò, ài, à;* but M. writes *oh*, while C. and ms. have *o*. In punctuation C. is discreet, M. excessive and illogical; in the use of accents to distinguish forms spelled alike, or for other purposes, M. is extravagant and inconsistent. A certain amount of modernization in the orthography is necessary, but editors do not agree as to how far or in what direction it shall go. How can foreigners hope to adopt a satisfactory system of orthography in Italian when the Italians themselves disagree not only in regard to the editing of old texts but in printing modern books? It would seem highly desirable for Italian scholars, *littérateurs*, and printers to devise and universally adopt some rational system of using accents and similar marks, so as to put an end to the present state of anarchy.

Fortunately, these matters only rarely affect the sense of Petrarch's writings; and whatever changes may be introduced in the standard text, which it is to be hoped will some day appear, will not be of such a nature as to hinder the continued usefulness of a concordance based upon editions now available. Indeed, it is conceivable that a concordance, by showing up inconsistencies and furnishing a trustworthy means of comparison, may greatly facilitate the preparation of a standard critical edition. The older editions, although they give the poems in a different order, were based on good manuscripts, so that the text itself does not read very differently. No one wishes that Dr. Fay had postponed the preparation of his concordance until he had a better text than Witte's to work with; and, in spite of the new readings that may be expected, Professor Sheldon was wise not to await the long-deferred edition of the *Vita Nuova* to be published by the Società Dantesca Italiana.

This long discussion of the history of concordances, and of means and end in making them, has probably demonstrated that they are books of manifold usefulness, and may be constructed in various ways. Doctors will doubtless continue to disagree as to what they are, and what are their proper functions; but, however faulty their construction, they are invaluable aids to scholarship, and their usefulness will increase according to the square of the common sense used in making them.

KENNETH McKENZIE

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

T
and
boo
way
are
cor
ful
us

AUG 14 1980

RETURN TO: CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
198 Main Stacks

LOAN PERIOD 1 Home Use	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS.
Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.
Books may be renewed by calling 642-3405.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW.

MAR 1 2 2006		

FORM NO. DD6
50M 1-05

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
Berkeley, California 94720–6000

Stockton, Calif.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C027404005